



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,917	02/12/2007	Jens Heinemann	HEINEMANN-8	3829
20151	7590	03/21/2011	EXAMINER	
HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC				YIP, KENT
HENRY M FEIEREISEN				
708 THIRD AVENUE				
SUITE 1501				
NEW YORK, NY 10017				2625
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
03/21/2011			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@FEIEREISENLLC.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/570,917	HEINEMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kent Yip	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 27-48 and 50-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 27-48 and 50-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 49 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim 49 is missing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 51 recites the limitation "theft prevention unit" while the parent claims 39 and 48 recite the limitation "theft prevention means". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (US 2004/0120008) in view of Manross et al. (US 6466830) and Nihei (US 7098942).

Regarding claim 27, Morgan teaches a method for creating individual pictures, cards and similar items (abstract) comprising at least the following steps:

- a) explaining the method to a user on a preview window on a system screen (p0060, p0066-0067, p0118 Fig. 1-2 [14, 16], Fig. 4 [2]);
- c) then selecting a motif for the picture, card or item from standard motifs available from stored motifs (p0102), or from one or more motifs supplied by the user and embedding the motif in a layout;
- d) then, optionally creating a portrait recording of the user and embedding the portrait recording in the layout (p0102 Fig. 4 [7]);
- e) integrating a desired text into the layout (p0100 Fig. 4 [8]);

f) selecting to print, send or store a ready to output product on the screen after the product is either edited or corrected by repeating at least steps c) to e) (p0102, p0120-0122 Fig. 4 [7-8]);

h) thereafter receiving the outputted finished product (Fig. 4 [10-11]).

Morgan does not explicitly teach b) thereafter activating a communication and language selection and selecting the language for further transaction by a user for at least one of, the transaction language and the picture, card or item to be created;

g) then activating the billing and payment function.

Manross teaches b) thereafter activating a communication and language selection and selecting the language for further transaction by a user for at least one of, the transaction language and the picture, card or item to be created (col 2 lines 43-54).

Morgan and Manross are in the same field of endeavor of photo kiosk. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the photo kiosk of Morgan to include a multiple language selection means as taught by Manross allowing customers who use a language to access the kiosk.

Nihei teaches g) then activating the billing and payment function (col 6 lines 8-15).

Morgan and Nihei are in the same field of endeavor of photo kiosk. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the photo kiosk of Morgan to include a fee calculating and

collecting means ability as taught by Nihei to more accurately determine costs based on user desired print settings.

Regarding claim 28, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method for creating individual pictures, cards or similar item according to claim 27, wherein the portrait recording is carried out by means of a digital video camera by recording a sequence of images of the user and selecting from a so recorded video stream a suitable image either manually or automatically (Morgan p0062, p0101).

Regarding claim 29, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method according to claim 28, wherein a format is selected which is a DP stream in progressive recording mode (Morgan p0062).

Regarding claim 30, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 28, wherein the user has an opportunity to select a suitable image through manual selection (Morgan p0101).

Regarding claim 31, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method according to claim 28, wherein the user is offered an interaction element for selecting an individual image (Morgan p0101).

Regarding claim 32, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 28, wherein during automatic selection, an image of optimal quality is selected (Morgan p0062, p0101).

Regarding claim 33, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 28, wherein the user is illuminated by an LED light during recording of the video stream (Morgan p0096 Fig. 1-2 34, p0067; Examiner takes official notice that it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of invention that a light bulb or LEDs can be a source of light.)

Regarding claim 34, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 33, wherein a user can select from at least four images of the video stream (Morgan p0101).

Regarding claim 35, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 28, wherein one or more images are displayed for viewing on a screen for preview (Morgan p0101).

Regarding claim 36, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 28, wherein the finished product is printed out (Morgan p0072-0082), sent as an e-mail, saved on storage media or saved to an online database offered by the system (Morgan p0101, p0109, p0111).

Regarding claim 37, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 36, wherein the layouts are selected from external stationary (Morgan p0091) or mobile media or online databases.

Regarding claim 38, Morgan in view of Manross and Nihei teach the method of claim 36, wherein transfer means are used for interfacing with internet, wireless connection or external peripheral devices (Morgan p0108-0109, p0111).

5. Claims 39-48, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (US 2004/0120008) in view of Jones (US 2002/0154327).

Regarding claim 39, Morgan teaches an interactive machine for the individual design of pictures, cards, postcards and similar items (p0060, p0075 Fig. 1-3) comprising at least:

- a) a monitor (p0066 [14]);
- b) a camera with an adjustment apparatus (p0062-0065 [12])
- c) a lighting unit (p0067, p0096 [34]);
- d) means for operating the machine (p0067 [16]);
- e) at least one interface for communication with external storage media and internet connection (p0108-0109, p0111);
- f) an integrated DP system comprising at least one internal storage unit (p0062, p0101);
- g) an output apparatus for creating at least one of, the picture and the cards (p0082 [18]);
- h) a payment unit (p0098 [38, 40]);
- j) a power supply (p0114 [10]);
- k) means for location-independent placement of the machine (p0110 [10]);
- l) theft prevention means (p0099);
- m) a remote maintenance unit (p0108).

Morgan does not explicitly teach i) a postage unit.

Jones teaches i) a postage unit (p0028 and p0033).

Morgan and Jones are in the same field of endeavor of photo kiosk. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify the postcard printing photo kiosk of Morgan (p0075) to include a means to print postage as taught by Jones that provides a user a convenient method of creating a stamped postcard.

Regarding claim 40, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the camera includes a digital video camera for generating a video stream (Morgan p0062).

Regarding claim 41, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the lighting unit includes a photometer and a plurality of LED diodes for generating constant light for illumination of the user (Morgan p0096 Fig. 1-2 34, p0067; Examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of invention that a light bulb or LEDs can be a source of light.).

Regarding claim 42, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the monitor is a touch screen monitor (Morgan p0066-0067).

Regarding claim 43, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the machine is operated by at least one of, a keyboard (Morgan p0067) and a joystick.

Regarding claim 44, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the output unit is a thermo sublimation printer (Morgan p0072 [18]).

Regarding claim 45, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the interface is suitable for various storage media (Morgan p0097, p0109, p0111).

Regarding claim 46, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein an additional power supply in the form of a solar module is provided and for charging batteries (Morgan p0114).

Regarding claim 47, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the machine is provided with wheels, coasters or a carrying appliance (Morgan p0110).

Regarding claim 48, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the theft prevention means include at least one of physical attachment of the machine at the location (Morgan p0099) and radio signals that are acoustically or visually perceptible or via radio.

Regarding claim 50, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the remote maintenance unit functions by wireless communications or via cables (Morgan p0108).

Regarding claim 52, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 39, wherein the machine has surfaces for carrying advertisement that are background illuminated or is an electronic advertising panel (Morgan p0105).

6. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (US 2004/0120008) in view of Jones (US 2002/0154327) and Millet et al. (US 2004/0085449 continuation of No. 09/464221 filed 12/15/1999).

Regarding claim 51, Morgan in view of Jones teaches the machine of claim 48.

Morgan does not explicitly teach wherein the theft prevention unit features a motion sensor for the detection of approaching persons.

Millet teaches wherein the theft prevention unit features a motion sensor for the detection of approaching persons (p0056).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Morgan's means of kiosk security (p0099) to include a motion detector as taught by Millet (p0056) that automatically monitors activity thus improving security.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Yip whose telephone number is (571) 270-5244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 10:00 AM - 6:00 PM EDT.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler L. Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625